Non-perturbative gluon-hadron inputs for all available forms of QCD factorization

B.I. Ermolaev
Ioffe Physico-Technical Institute, 194021

S.I. Troyan
St.Petersburg Institute of Nuclear Physics, 188300 Gatchina, Russia

arXiv:1610.09953v1 [hep-ph] 31 Oct 2016

Description of hadronic reactions at high energies is conventionally done on basis of QCD factorization so that factorization convolutions involve non-perturbative inputs mimicking non-perturbative contributions and perturbative evolution of those inputs. We construct the inputs for the gluon-hadron scattering amplitudes in the forward kinematics and, using the Optical theorem, convert them into inputs for gluon distributions in the both polarized and unpolarized hadrons. Firstly, we derive general mathematical criteria which any model for the inputs should obey and then suggest a Resonance Model satisfying those criteria. This model is inspired by a simple observation: after emitting an active parton off the hadron, the remaining ensemble of spectators becomes unstable and therefore it can be described through factors of the resonance type. Exploiting Resonance Model, we obtain non-perturbative inputs for gluon distributions in unpolarized and polarized hadrons for all available forms of QCD factorization: Basic, K_T- and Collinear Factorizations. We compare the obtained inputs to the inputs available in the literature.

PACS numbers: 12.38.Cy

I. INTRODUCTION

Description of hadronic reactions at high energies requires knowledge of QCD in the perturbative and non-perturbative domains. However, such calculations cannot be done in the straightforward way because the non-perturbative QCD is poorly-known. The most efficient approximation approach to theory of hadronic reactions is QCD factorization, where perturbative QCD calculations are complemented by phenomenological fits or model expressions which mimic non-perturbative QCD contributions. Throughout the present paper we will address those expressions as non-perturbative inputs. Technically speaking, such inputs act as initial conditions for the evolution equations which account for perturbative contributions. The inputs are supposed to approximately describe short-time dissociations of each of the colliding hadrons into active partons and spectators, with interactions of the active partons being described by Perturbative QCD. There are various scenarios of such interactions, depending on the number of the active partons. The scenario where each hadron emits one active parton is called the single-parton scattering (SPS). It is the simplest and most popular scenario. More complicated scenarios, where one of the colliding hadrons or both of them emit more than one active parton are addressed as multi-parton scattering (MPS). An example of a factorized amplitude for the hadron-hadron scattering under the SPS approximation is depicted in Fig. 1. When such SPS amplitudes are conjugated with the mirror amplitudes, the t-channel parton states between the blobs consist of two partons only. For instance, Fig. 2 depicts the SPS scenario for QCD factorization of the hadronic tensor $W_{\mu\nu}$ for DIS off a hadron. The lowest blob in Fig. 2 stands for a non-perturbative input describing emission (absorption) of the active partons with momentum k off (by) the initial hadron with momentum p while the upper blob corresponds to DIS off the active partons.



FIG. 1. Amplitude for the Single-Parton Scattering of hadrons h_1 and h_2 , with active partons being gluons. Blobs $A_{1,2}$ denote emission of the active gluons. Interaction of those gluons is depicted by blob B, where the outgoing arrows denote the produced partons. The outgoing double arrows on blobs $A_{1,2}$ stand for the final state spectators.

When the s-cut ($s = (p+q)^2$) in Fig. 2 is not implied, Fig. 2 represents factorization of the amplitude $A_{\mu\nu}$ of the elastic Compton scattering off the hadron in the forward kinematics, with two-parton t-channel intermediate states between the blobs being accounted for. Throughout the present paper we consider the SPS scenario, leaving the less popular MPS scenario for future study.



FIG. 2. QCD factorization for the DIS hadronic tensor. The s-cut of the graph is implied. The lowest blob includes the non-perturbative input while the upper blob corresponds to DIS off the active parton.

The Optical theorem relates the elastic scattering amplitudes in the forward kinematics to cross-sections. For example, it relates $A_{\mu\nu}$ to $W_{\mu\nu}$:

$$W_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{\pi}\Im_s A_{\mu\nu}. \quad (1)$$

So, in order to calculate cross-sections or parton distributions under the SPS approximation, it is sufficient to calculate the related elastic amplitudes with two-parton states between the blobs. Throughout the paper we will address such partons as intermediate partons. In contrast, the number of partons in the t-channel states inside the upper (perturbative) blobs is arbitrary. In what follows we will refer to the lowest blobs in factorization convolutions (e.g. the lowest blob in Fig. 2) as non-perturbative inputs regardless of whether they have the s-channel cut or not.

There are several forms of QCD factorization available in the literature and each of them is tailored to a specific perturbative approach. We briefly consider them in the context of DIS. The point is that none of the known Evolution Equations can operate in the whole range of x and Q^2. In the region of $x \sim 1$, the evolutions in the longitudinal sub-space (we refer to it as the x-evolution) and in the transverse sub-space (the $k_\perp^2$-evolution) are approximately independent and accounting for the $k_\perp^2$-evolution is most important. This evolution is governed by the DGLAP equations[1]. They control to all orders in α_s the evolution in the $k_\perp$-space from some starting point μ^2 up to a higher scale Q^2, leaving the x-evolution either totally unaccounted for (in LO) or taken into account in few orders in α_s (in NLO,NNLO, etc). Values of μ are chosen in the perturbative range: $\mu \sim$ few GeV. Therefore, the $k_\perp^2$-evolution in DGLAP is controlled by perturbative means. In contrast, implementing the x-evolution is achieved through convoluting the DGLAP results with fits[2] which, being implicitly μ-depend, explicitly depend on the longitudinal variable. Therefore, those fits exploit the simplest, collinear kinematics for the connecting partons (see Fig. 2):

$$k = \beta p, \quad (2)$$

with β ($1 \leq \beta \leq x$ in factorization convolutions) being the longitudinal momentum fraction. Such form of QCD factorization is called Collinear Factorization[3] and μ in the factorization context is called the factorization scale.

The approximation that the evolution in the $k_\perp^2$-space can be studied independently of the evolution in the x-space is reliable for $x \sim 1$ but is known to fail at $x \ll 1$. In other words, factorization of the phase space into the longitudinal and transverse sub-spaces is broken at $x \ll 1$, so DGLAP becomes inconsistent at small x and should be replaced by new evolution equations comprising the both x- and $k_\perp^2$-evolutions. For non-singlet structure functions, where the leading contributions are double-logarithmic (DL), it was done by composing and solving Infrared Evolution Equations (IREE) for the DIS structure functions (for application of IREE to DIS see the overviews in Ref. [4]). The principal concept of IREE was proposed by L.N. Lipatov[5]. Its essence is first to neglect the involved quark masses in order to deal with virtual quarks and gluons equally, then introduce an IR cut-off in the $k_\perp$-space to regulate IR divergences and study evolution of IR-dependent DL contributions with respect to such cut-off. In this approach the both x- and $k_\perp^3$- evolutions are accounted for with Perturbative QCD, with μ acting as the IR cut-off and factorization scale at the same time, so one can use again Collinear Factorization, where new fits depend on x weaker than the DGLAP fits.

In contrast, the leading (single-logarithmic) contributions to the x-evolution of the structure function F_1 at small x are IR stable. The best-known approach to account for them to all orders in α_s is the BFKL equation[6]. It is free of IR divergences and because of that integrations over transverse momenta in BFKL run down to zero. This approach operates with essentially non-collinear initial partons, which excludes neglecting their transverse components and as a result, it excludes a simple matching of BFKL with Collinear Factorization. By this reason, K_T-Factorization[7] named also High-Energy Factorization[8] was suggested. To parameterize momentum k of the intermediate partons in factorization convolutions, K_T-Factorization involves the same longitudinal parameter β and, in addition, accounts for the transverse momentum $k_\perp$:

$$k = \beta p + k_\perp. \quad (3)$$

There are different ways to construct the non-perturbative inputs in Collinear and K_T- Factorizations. Quite often they are introduced entirely on basis of practical reasons without any theoretical grounds. On the other hand, there are the models with solid theoretical background. In particular, the models in Ref. [9] are actually based on various theoretical approaches to approximate the problem of confinement: the chiral quark-soliton model, diquark model, etc. The features of the saturation model[10] are used in Refs. [11, 12] for modeling the inputs in the context of K_T-Factorization while the model in Ref. [13] combines features of a variety of models for the Fock space wave function on the light cone. An overview of the most popular models of hadrons can be found in Ref. [14]. An alternative approach is the lattice calculations. This is a complementary method to study the non-perturbative inputs for parton distributions. Some of the recent results of the lattice calculations can be found is Ref. [15].

Eq. (3) demonstrates that parametrization of momentum k in K_T- Factorization is more general than the collinear parametrization (2). However, it misses one parameter, which can be seen from comparison of Eq. (3) to the standard Sudakov parametrization[16]:

$$k = -\alpha p' + \beta q' + k_\perp. \tag{4}$$

Parameter α is absent in the K_T-parametrization (3). The light-cone momenta p', q' in Eq. (4) are made of the external momenta p and q (see Fig. 2):

$$p' = p - x_p q,\ q' = q - x_q p,\ x_p \approx p^2/w,\ x_q \approx q^2/w,\ w = 2p'q' \approx 2pq. \tag{5}$$

Recently we presented the most general kind of QCD factorization[17]: Basic Factorization where all components of momentum k are taken into account. Then we proved that Basic Factorization can step-by-step be reduced to K_T-Factorization and to Collinear Factorization. Doing so, we did not specify non-perturbative inputs and inferred general theoretical constraints on the inputs. Those constraints follow from the obvious requirement: integrating the factorization convolutions must yield finite results. In Ref. [18] we suggested a new model for the non-perturbative inputs to quark distributions in hadrons. This model is based on a simple observation: after emitting an active parton(s) off the hadron, the ensemble of remaining spectators becomes unstable, so it can be described by expressions of the resonance type. Because of that we address this model in Ref, [18] as the Resonance Model. However, the very important case of the inputs for gluon distributions in hadrons was left uninspected in Ref. [18].

In the present paper we continue studying the Resonance Model and present explicit expressions for the gluon the non-perturbative inputs, considering the cases of both polarized and unpolarized hadrons. We start with calculation of the color singlet contributions to the gluon-hadron elastic scattering amplitudes and, using the Optical theorem, arrive at the gluon distributions in the hadrons first in Basic Factorization and then in K_T- and Collinear Factorizations. By definition, K_T- Factorization operates in the small-x kinematic region, so throughout the present paper we will focus on this region.

Our paper is organized as follows: In Section II we study first the Born approximation for the elastic gluon-hadron amplitudes in the forward kinematic and then analyze the impact of radiative corrections. We investigate the convergence of the factorization convolutions for non-perturbative inputs in general, to obtain universal constraints on the non-perturbative inputs. In Section III we derive criteria for the non-perturbative inputs in Basic Factorization and use them to construct a Resonance Model. Transition from the Basic Factorization to K_T- Factorization is considered in Sect. IV. In this Sect. we also compare our results with the ones available in the literature. In Sect. V we reduce the inputs in K_T- Factorization down to the ones in Collinear Factorization. We focus here on comparing our results with the standard DGLAP-fits. At last, Sect. VI is for our concluding remarks.

II. ELASTIC GLUON-HADRON SCATTERING AMPLITUDES IN THE FORWARD KINEMATICS

In this Sect. we consider QCD factorization of the elastic gluon-hadron scattering amplitude in the forward kinematics and inspect integrability of the factorization convolutions representing this amplitude in Basic Factorization[1]. We will consider only the part of this amplitude which is colorless in the t-channel. The convolutions describing the colorless gluon-hadron amplitude A are represented by the sum of two graphs: the graph in Fig. 3 and a similar graph, where q is replaced by $-q$.

Our aim here is to obtain mathematical restrictions on the non-perturbative inputs. In order to do it, we use the obvious reasoning: Integration over momentum k in the factorization convolution in Fig. 3 should yield a finite result. Features of the perturbative components of the convolutions are known, at least qualitatively, so the integrability requirement can be used to establish necessary restrictions on the non-perturbative inputs. Then any model for the inputs should obey those restrictions, so they can be used as criteria for accepting or rejecting the models. First we consider amplitude A in the Born approximation and then examine an impact of the radiative corrections.

A. Gluon-hadron scattering amplitudes in the Born approximation

In the first place, let us consider the simplest factorization convolution, where the perturbative contribution is in the Born approximation. In this case the upper blob in Fig. 3 is represented by two simple graphs, each with the

[1] We remind that in the present paper we consider the Single-Parton Scattering scenario only.



FIG. 3. Factorization of amplitudes of hadron-gluon scattering in the forward kinematics, with intermediate partons being gluons. The upper blob corresponds to amplitudes of the elastic gluon scattering.

single-gluon exchange. The first graph, with a non-zero imaginary part in s, is depicted in Fig. 4 and the second graph, with a non-zero imaginary part in u, can be obtained from the first one by replacement $q \to -q$.



FIG. 4. Factorization for amplitude of hadron-gluon scattering in the Born approximation.

A remarkable feature of Basic Factorization is that the analytic expression corresponding to the convolution graphs can be obtained by applying the standard Feynman rules to the graphs. Applying these rules to the graph in Fig. 4 and complementing the result by the expression with $q \to -q$, we arrive at the following expression for the Born gluon-hadron amplitude A^B in Basic Factorization:

$$A^B = \frac{4\pi\alpha_s N}{(2\pi)^4}\int d^4k\; l_\mu l'_\nu \left[\frac{H_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}(q,k)}{s_2+\imath\epsilon} + \frac{H_{\nu\mu\lambda\rho}(-q,k)}{u_2+\imath\epsilon}\right]\frac{1}{k^2k^2}T_{\lambda\rho}(k,p,S), \tag{6}$$

where $s_2 = (q+k)^2,\ u_2 = (q-k)^2$, $N = 3$ is the color factor and S denotes the hadron spin. The term in squared brackets corresponds to the Born amplitude for gluon-gluon scattering, $l_\mu(q)$ and $l'_\nu(q)$ denote the polarization vectors of the external gluons, the terms $1/k^2$ correspond to propagators of the active gluons and the input $T_{\lambda\rho}$ contains non-pertrurbative contributions only. Throughout the paper we use the Feynman gauge. Let us notice that both $T_{\lambda\rho}$ and the term in the squared brackets are dimensionless. The perturbative term $H_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}$ in Eq. (6) is

$$H_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} = \left[(-q-2k)_\mu g_{\lambda\sigma} + (2q+k)_\lambda g_{\mu\sigma} + (k-q)_\sigma g_{\mu\lambda}\right]\left[(q+2k)_\nu g_{\rho\sigma} + (-2q-k)_\rho g_{\nu\sigma} + (q-k)_\sigma g_{\nu\rho}\right]. \tag{7}$$

It is easy to check that A^B with $H_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho}$ given by Eq. (7) is gauge-invariant at small x. Let us note that the gauge invariance for the quark-hadron scattering amplitudes considered in Ref. [18] is also gauge-invariant at small x.

In order to make further progress we should specify $T_{\lambda\rho}$. First of all, let us specify its polarization (tensor) structure. To this end, let us remember that when the hadron is replaced by a bare quark, $T_{\lambda\rho}$ is replaced by the quark-gluon Born amplitude $Q_{\lambda\rho}$. It consists of the unpolarized part $Q^U_{\lambda\rho}$ and the spin-dependent part $Q^S_{\lambda\rho}$:

$$Q_{\lambda\rho} = Q^U_{\lambda\rho} + Q^S_{\lambda\rho}, \tag{8}$$

with

$$Q^U_{\lambda\rho} = (2p_\lambda p_\rho - k_\lambda p_\rho + p_\lambda k_\rho - pk\ g_{\lambda\rho}) \left(\frac{-8\pi\alpha_s C_F}{(p-k)^2 - m_q^2 + \imath\epsilon} \right), \tag{9}$$
$$Q^S_{\lambda\rho} = \imath m_q \epsilon_{\lambda\rho\sigma\tau} k_\sigma (S_q)_\tau \left(\frac{-8\pi\alpha_s C_F}{(p-k)^2 - m_q^2 + \imath\epsilon} \right),$$

where m_q is the quark mass, S_q is the quark spin and $C_F = 4/3$. Apparently, when the bare quark is replaced by a proton, Eqs. (8,9) must be changed. We presume the simplest modification of Eqs. (8,9) for that case: The tensor $T_{\lambda\rho}$ inherits the polarization structure of $Q^{U,S}_{\lambda\rho}$ whereas the bare quark propagator (the expression in brackets in Eqs. (8,9)) is replaced by more complicated invariants $M^{U,S}$:

$$T_{\lambda\rho} = T^U_{\lambda\rho} + T^S_{\lambda\rho}, \tag{10}$$

with

$$T^U_{\lambda\rho} = (2p_\lambda p_\rho - k_\lambda p_\rho - p_\lambda k_\rho + pk\ g_{\lambda\rho})\, M_U(s_1, k^2), \tag{11}$$
$$T^S_{\lambda\rho} = \imath m_h \epsilon_{\lambda\rho\sigma\tau} k_\sigma S_\tau M_S(s_1, k^2),$$

where m_h, S are the hadron mass and spin respectively and $s_1 = (p-k)^2$. The invariant amplitudes M_U and M_S may either coincide or be different. A similar reasoning can be used when the hadrons have more complicated spin structure. Substituting $T^{U,S}_{\lambda\rho}$ in Eq. (6), we obtain:

$$A^B_U = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \left[4\pi\alpha_s N \left(\frac{N^{(1)}_s}{s_2 + \imath\epsilon} + \frac{N^{(1)}_u}{u_2 + \imath\epsilon} \right) \right] \frac{1}{k^2 k^2} M_U(s_1, k^2), \tag{12}$$

$$A^B_S = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \left[4\pi\alpha_s N \left(\frac{N^{(2)}_s}{s_2 + \imath\epsilon} + \frac{N^{(2)}_u}{u_2 + \imath\epsilon} \right) \right] \frac{1}{k^2 k^2} M_S(s_1, k^2), \tag{13}$$

with

$$N^{(1)}_s = 4k^2(2m_h^2 + 2pk) - 16(2(pq)^2 + 2(pq)(pk) - q^2(pk)) + u_2(2M_h^2 - 2pk), \tag{14}$$
$$N^{(2)}_s = \imath m_h \epsilon_{\lambda\rho\sigma\tau} S_\tau \left[8q_\rho \left(l'_\lambda k_\sigma (kl) - l_\lambda k_\sigma (kl') \right) - u_2 k_\sigma l_\lambda l'_\rho \right].$$

We have done summation over the gluon polarizations in the expression for $N^{(1)}_s$ in Eq. (14). In what follows we will use the Sudakov variables defined in Eq. (4). In their terms

$$2pk = -\alpha w + \beta x_p w, \quad 2qk = \beta w - \alpha x_q w, \ k^2 = -\alpha\beta w - k_\perp^2. \tag{15}$$

B. Analysis of IR and UV singularities of the Born amplitudes

Let us consider integrability of the Born gluon-hadron amplitudes $A^B_{U,S}$ of Eqs. (12,13). First of all, let us note that the Born perturbative contributions (the terms in parentheses) are obviously free of divergences and do not need any regularization. However, the integration over k runs over the whole phase space, so it includes the point $k^2 = 0$, where the factors $1/k^2$ become divergent. There is no physical reason to cut off this point from the integration region. In other words, there is no reason to introduce any cut-off to regulate those singularities. It leaves us with the only option to get rid of those divergences: inputs $M_{U,S}$ in Eqs. (12,13) at small k^2 must decrease rapidly enough in order to kill these IR singularities. Therefore, we infer that $M_{U,S}$ should satisfy the following restrictions at $k^2 \to 0$:

$$M_{U,S}(s_1, k^2) \sim \left(k^2\right)^{1+\eta}, \tag{16}$$

with $\eta > 0$. Eq. (16) guarantees IR stability of the integrals in Eqs. (12,13). Then, there may be UV singularities in Eqs. (19,20) at large $|k|$, i.e. at large $|\alpha|$ when the Sudakov variables are used and the integration over α goes first. It is easy to see that the integrands in Eqs. (12,13) at large $|\alpha|$ behave as

$$\sim \frac{\alpha^2}{\alpha^3} M_{U,S} \tag{17}$$

which can be UV-divergent. In order to kill this divergence, $M_{U,S}$ should decrease at large α:

$$M_{U,S} \sim \alpha^{-\chi}, \tag{18}$$

with $\chi > 0$. In other words, the non-perturbative inputs should decrease, when their invariant energy s_1 grows.

C. Gluon-hadron scattering amplitudes beyond the Born approximation

Diagrammatically, accounting for the radiative corrections to the Born amplitudes $A_{U,S}$ of Eqs. (16,18) can be done with adding more gluon and quark propagators to the single-gluon blob in Fig. 4 and summing up contributions of such graphs. This procedure converts the Born perturbative amplitudes (the upper blob in Fig. 4,) into amplitudes $A_{U,S}^{(pert)}$, but keeps unchanged the non-perturbative contributions $M_{U,S}$. As a result, we arrive at the expressions

$$A_U = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} A_U^{(pert)}(s_2, q^2, k^2) \frac{1}{k^2 k^2} M_U(s_1, k^2), \tag{19}$$

$$A_S = \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} A_S^{(pert)}(s_2, q^2, k^2) \frac{1}{k^2 k^2} M_S(s_1, k^2), \tag{20}$$

where the amplitudes $A_{S,U}^{(pert)}$ are perturbative while $M_{S,U}$ are non-perturbative. Such total separation of the perturbative and non-perturbative contributions is a remarkable feature of our approach. Amplitudes $A_{U,S}^{(pert)}$ depend on s_2, k^2, q^2 but they are dimensionless and therefore they depend on dimensionless combinations of their arguments. It is convenient to choose such combinations as follows:

$$A_{U,S}^{(pert)}(s_2, q^2, k^2) = A_{U,S}^{(pert)}\left(s_2/q^2, s_2/k^2\right). \tag{21}$$

Now we show that the conditions of IR and UV stability of amplitudes $A_{U,S}$ in Eqs. (19,20) are given by Eqs. (16,18). In order to do it, we should anew examine singularities of the integrands in Eqs. (19,20), which is more complicated than in Eqs. (12,13). The point is that, in addition to the divergences considered in Sect. IIC, there are IR and UV divergences of the perturbative contributions $A_{U,S}^{(pert)}$. We call them the intrinsic singularities. Fortunately, it is easy to handle them in Basic Factorization.

Let us first consider regulating intrinsic IR divergences of the off-shell amplitudes $A_{U,S}^{(pert)}$. The standard way to regulate IR divergences in Perturbative QCD is to introduce IR cut-offs. When the amplitudes are off-shell, the virtualities of their external partons act as the cut-offs. It was done first in Ref. [16] and then was used in numerous papers, including the recent Ref. [19]. Therefore, q^2 and k^2 can be used as IR cut-offs for $A_{U,S}^{(pert)}$.

Now let us consider regulation of the intrinsic UV divergences of $A_{U,S}^{(pert)}$. Again, there are two sources of UV divergences This problem is also easily solved because QCD is a renormalizable theory, so all UV divergences to all order in α_s are automatically absorbed by redefinitions of α_s and masses of involved quarks and gluons.

After the IR and UV regularization has been done, the amplitudes $A_{U,S}^{(pert)}$ should be substituted in the factorization convolutions to be integrated over momentum k and here the divergences problem arises once more. The region of integration over k^2 in Eqs. (19,20) includes the point $k^2 = 0$, where both the propagators $1/k^2$ and the contributions $\sim s_2/k^2$ in $A_{U,S}^{(pert)}$ become singular. The integration over k runs over the whole phase space and we do not have any physical reason to restrict this integration region, introducing IR cut-offs. The only way out is to presume that a decrease of $M_{U,S}$ at $k^2 \to 0$ should be fast enough to kill the singularity. We have already shown that the constraint in Eq. (16) regulates the singularity at $k^2 = 0$ in the case of the Born perturbative amplitudes. Generally speaking, this

constraint could be violated when the amplitudes $A_{U,S}^{(pert)}$ are calculated beyond the Born approximation. However, this does not take place. Indeed, the power factor $\left(s_2/k^2\right)$ in the unpolarized parton distribution appears in the lowest order in α_s only, i.e. in Eq. (12), where its impact has been accounted for. The k^2-dependent contributions from higher loops are known to be of logarithmic type: $\sim \ln^n\left(s_2/k^2\right)$. Therefore, we find that accounting for radiative corrections to all orders in α_s does not change the restriction of IR stability in Eq. (16). A similar reasoning can be used for analysis of the UV stability restriction of Eq. (18): the fastest-growing with α terms in amplitudes $A_{U,S}^{(pert)}$ are $\sim \ln^n\left(w\alpha/q^2\right), \ln^n\left(w\alpha/k^2\right)$, so such logarithmic divergences can be regulated by the power-like restriction in Eq. (18). So, we ascertain that the restrictions in Eqs. (16,18) hold when the radiative corrections are taken into account to all orders in α_s.

III. MODELING THE NON-PERTURBATIVE INVARIANT AMPLITUDES $M_{U,S}$

In this Sect. we consider first the Resonance Model for non-perturbative amplitudes $M_{U,S}$ and then proceed to the non-perturbative inputs for the gluon distributions. Our models is based on simple and clear-cut physical arguments which we list below and call them criteria which any model for $M_{U,S}$ should satisfy. Although constructing such a model cannot be done unambiguously, any proposed model should satisfy the following criteria:
Criterion (i) Expressions for $M_{U,S}$ should satisfy the requirements of IR and UV stability of the factorization convolutions given in Eqs. (16,18).
Criterion (ii) Expressions for $M_{U,S}$ should have non-zero imaginary parts in s_1 to make possible the use of the Optical theorem. It is necessary in order to proceed from elastic gluon-hadron amplitudes to gluon distributions in the hadrons.
Criterion (iii) As both K_T- and Collinear Factorizations are particular cases of Basic Factorization, formulae for $M_{U,S}$ should enable reduction down to expressions which could be used in K_T- and Collinear Factorizations.

We suggest the following model expressions for the amplitudes $M_{U,S}(s_1, k^2)$:

$$M_U(s_1, k^2) = R_U\left(k^2\right) Z_U\left(s_1\right), \quad M_S(s_1, k^2) = R_S\left(k^2\right) Z_S\left(s_1\right). \tag{22}$$

Eq. (22) reads that dependences on s_1 and k^2 are separated. This is done for the sake of simplicity. We could assume that $R = R(k^2, s_1)$ but we find it unnecessary. As handling M_U and M_S is the same, we skip the subscripts U, S and will use the generic notation

$$M(s_1, k^2) = R(k^2)Z(s_1) \tag{23}$$

instead of the ones in Eq. (22). In order to satisfy Eq. (16), R in Eq. (23) should exhibit such a behavior:

$$R \sim \left(k^2\right)^{1+\eta} \tag{24}$$

at small k^2. According to Eq. (18), $RZ \sim \alpha^{-\chi}$ at large $|\alpha|$. A behavior of R at large $|\alpha|$ is unknown. However, it can be that its small-k^2 behavior remains unchanged at large $|\alpha|$. It means that

$$R \sim \alpha^{1+\eta} \tag{25}$$

at large $|\alpha|$. This is the most UV divergent case which cannot be ignored a priori, so in order to satisfy Eqs. (18,25), Z should behave as follows: at large $|\alpha|$

$$Z \sim \alpha^{-1-\eta-\chi}. \tag{26}$$

If R does not grow at large $|\alpha|$, which for instance takes place when the exponential parametrization

$$R = N\left(k^2\right)^{1+\eta} e^{-\lambda k^2} \tag{27}$$

is exploited, we can all the same use Z obeying Eq. (26). In order to specify Z, we suggest the guiding idea: After emitting an active parton by the initial hadron, the remaining set of quark and gluons pick up a color and therefore

it cannot be stable. Unstable states, in general, are known to be often modeled by expressions of the resonance type. In particular, we can approximate Z in Eq. (23) by the following expression:

$$Z(s_1) \approx Z_n(s_1) = \prod_{r=1}^{n} \frac{1}{(s_1 - M_r^2 + \imath\Gamma_r)}, \tag{28}$$

with arbitrary integer n. In order to get $Z_n(s_1)$ satisfying Eq. (26), we should choose $n > 1$. For the sake of simplicity, we consider the minimal value $n = 2$. Apparently, Z_2 can be written as an interference of two resonances:

$$Z(s_1) = \frac{1}{(\Delta M_{12}^2 + \imath\Delta\Gamma_{12})} \left[\frac{1}{(s_1 - M_1^2 + \imath\Gamma_1)} - \frac{1}{(s_1 - M_2^2 + \imath\Gamma_2)} \right], \tag{29}$$

with $\Delta M_{12}^2 = M_1^2 - M_2^2,\ \Delta\Gamma_{12} = \Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2$. In terms of the Sudakov variables,

$$M(w\alpha, k^2) = \frac{R(k^2)}{C_Z} \left[\frac{1}{(w\alpha - \mu_1^2 + k^2 + \imath\Gamma_1)} - \frac{1}{(w\alpha - \mu_2^2 + k^2 + \imath\Gamma_2)} \right], \tag{30}$$

where $C_Z = \left(\Delta M_{12}^2 + \imath\Delta\Gamma_{12}\right)$ and $\mu_{1,2}^2 = M_{1,2}^2 - p^2$. Applying the Optical theorem to Eq. (30) allows us to obtain the non-perturbative contribution D to the gluon distributions in the hadrons:

$$D = -\Im_{s_1} T = \frac{R(k^2)}{C_Z} \left[\frac{\Gamma_1}{\left(w\alpha + k^2 - \mu_1^2\right)^2 + \Gamma_1^2} - \frac{\Gamma_2}{\left(w\alpha + k^2 - \mu_2^2\right)^2 + \Gamma_2^2} \right]. \tag{31}$$

This expression is obviously of the Breit-Wigner type. Now, substituting Eqs. (30,27) in Eqs. (19,20), we arrive at the expressions for the gluon-hadron scattering amplitudes in Basic Factorization. Applying the Optical theorem to these expressions, we obtain the gluon distributions in Basic Factorization. On the other hand, Basic Factorization was suggested quite recently while K_T- and Collinear Factorizations are the conventional forms of QCD factorization. So, it is interesting to trace reduction of the inputs M and D down to inputs which can be used in K_T- and Collinear Factorizations.

IV. NON-PERTURBATIVE GLUON INPUTS IN K_T- FACTORIZATION

In the present Sect. we focus on the problem of reducing $M(\alpha, \beta, k^2)$ down to a new expression $M_{KT}(\beta, k_\perp^2)$ which can be used in K_T-Factorization. A general prescription of such reduction was formulated in Ref. [17, 18]. According to it, we should integrate out the α-dependence of $M(\alpha, \beta, k^2)$ without dealing with the perturbative contribution $A^{(pert)}$, which cannot be done in the straightforward way because the perturbative amplitudes $A^{(pert)}$ depend on α through their k^2-dependence (see Eq. (15)). That dependence can be neglected in the region

$$w|\alpha\beta| \ll k_\perp^2, \tag{32}$$

where $k^2 \approx -k_\perp^2$. At the same time, it is well-known that all most-essential at small x perturbative contributions arrive from the region (32). For example, all logarithmic contributions in the both DGLAP and BFKL approaches come from that region. In the region (32) $A^{(pert)}(w\beta, q^2, k^2)$ can be approximated by $A^{(pert)}(w\beta, k_\perp^2)$ and therefore it stops to be α-dependent. Hence, the only α -dependent factors in Eqs. (19,20) are the inputs M (i.e. M_u and M_s) and they have to be integrated over α in region (32). Doing so, we reduce M to M_{KT}:

$$M_{KT}(\beta, k_\perp^2) = \int_{-\alpha_0}^{\alpha_0} d\alpha M(\alpha, \beta, k^2), \tag{33}$$

with

$$\alpha_0 \ll k_\perp^2/(w\beta). \tag{34}$$

Eq. (34) does not specify α_0 unambiguously. To do it, we choose the simplest option:

$$\alpha_0 = \xi k_\perp^2/\beta, \tag{35}$$

with a positive ξ obeying the inequality $\xi \ll 1$. Combining Eqs. (30,33,35) we arrive at the following expression for the non-perturbative input M_{KT} in K_T -Factorization:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{KT} &\approx R\left(k_\perp^2\right)\left[\frac{1}{\xi k_\perp^2/\beta - \mu_1^2 + \imath\Gamma_1} + \frac{1}{\xi k_\perp^2/\beta - \mu_2^2 + \imath\Gamma_2} + \frac{1}{\xi k_\perp^2/\beta + \mu_1^2 - \imath\Gamma_1} + \frac{1}{\xi k_\perp^2/\beta + \mu_2^2 - \imath\Gamma_2}\right] \\ &= R'\left(k_\perp^2\right)\left[\frac{1}{k_\perp^2/\beta - \mu'^2_1 + \imath\Gamma'_1} + \frac{1}{k_\perp^2/\beta - \mu'^2_2 + \imath\Gamma'_2} + \frac{1}{k_\perp^2/\beta + \mu'^2_1 - \imath\Gamma'_1} + \frac{1}{k_\perp^2/\beta + \mu'^2_2 - \imath\Gamma'_2}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where $R' = R/\xi$, , and

$$\mu'^2_{1,2} = \mu^2_{1,2}/\xi,\ \Gamma'_{1,2} = \Gamma_{1,2}/\xi. \tag{37}$$

Corrections to the approximate expression for M_{KT} in Eq. (36) are small when

$$w\alpha_0 \gg \mu^2_{1,2}, \qquad \Gamma_{1,2} \gg \Delta\mu^2, \Delta\Gamma, \tag{38}$$

i.e. when $k_\perp^2$ is outside the resonance region $k_\perp^2/\beta \sim \mu'^2_{1,2}$. The closer $k_\perp^2/\beta$ is to $\mu'^2_{1,2}$ the greater are corrections to Eq. (36). It means that transition from Basic Factorization to K_T-Factorization is well-compatible with the Resonance Model outside the resonance region only. The main attractive feature of Eq. (36) is its resonance form which is similar to Eq. (30). In order to justify application of Eq. (36) within the resonance region, we use the following reasoning: First, we derive Eq. (36) from Eq. (30) in region (38) and then analytically continue it into the resonance region. In a sense, such a strategy is equivalent to independent specifying M_{KT} by Eq. (36) in K_T-Factorization. Applying the Optical theorem to Eq. (36), we arrive at the gluon distributions D_{KT} in K_T-Factorization, where

$$D_{KT} = \Phi_R + \Phi_B, \tag{39}$$

with

$$\Phi_R = R'\left(k_\perp^2\right)\left(\frac{\Gamma'_1}{(k_\perp^2/\beta - \mu'^2_1)^2 + \Gamma'^2_1} + \frac{\Gamma'_2}{(k_\perp^2/\beta - \mu'^2_2)^2 + \Gamma'^2_2}\right) \tag{40}$$

and

$$\Phi_B = R'\left(k_\perp^2\right)\left(\frac{\Gamma'_1}{(k_\perp^2/\beta + \mu'^2_1)^2 + \Gamma'^2_1} + \frac{\Gamma'_2}{(k_\perp^2/\beta + \mu'^2_2)^2 + \Gamma'^2_2}\right). \tag{41}$$

Each of $\Phi_{R,B}$ obviously consists of expressions of the Breit-Wigner type. Signs of μ'^2_1 and μ'^2_2 cannot be fixed a priory, but $\Phi_R \leftrightarrows \Phi_B$ when $\mu'^2_{1,2} \to -\mu'^2_{1,2}$, so we can consider the case of positive $\mu'^2_{1,2}$ without loss of generality. We remind that $k_\perp^2 > 0$, so Φ_R is within the resonant region $k_\perp^2 \sim \mu^2_{1,2}$ while Φ_B is out of that region. Therefore, the non-perturbative input Φ in K_T -Factorization is represented by its resonance part Φ_R and the background contribution Φ_B. It makes this formula look quite similar to the expressions obtained with Duality.

A. Discussion of the distribution D_{KT}

First of all, let us compare the mass parameters $\mu_{1,2}$ of the gluon distribution D of Eq. (31) in Basic Factorization and the parameters $\mu'_{1,2}$ of the gluon distribution D_{KT} of Eq. (39) in K_T- Factorization. They are related by Eq. (37). As $\xi \ll 1$, Eq. (37) means that $\mu'_1 \gg \mu_1,\ \mu'_2 \gg \mu_2$. Then, we would like to comment on the parameter R in Eq. (31). This parameter describes the dependence of D on k^2. After transition to K_T- Factorization, k^2 in $R(k^2)$ is replaced

by $k_\perp^2$ (we skip here the numerical factor ξ as unessential for the moment). The only rigorous knowledge on $R(k_\perp^2)$ is its small-$k_\perp$ behavior:

$$R \sim \left(k_\perp^2\right)^\eta \tag{42}$$

at $k_\perp^2 \to 0$. Eq. (42) follows from the IR stability requirement of Eq. (16). The most popular expressions to model for R in the recent literature[10–13] are the exponentials (Gaussians). In the simplest form it is

$$R_0 = N \exp[-\lambda k_\perp^2]. \tag{43}$$

Obviously, Eq. (43) contradicts to Eq. (42), so R_0 must be modified. The simplest modification of Eq. (43) compatible with Eq. (42) is

$$R_1 = N \left(k_\perp^2\right)^\eta \exp[-\lambda k_\perp^2]. \tag{44}$$

Expressions similar to (44) were suggested in Refs. [11, 12].

It is interesting to note some resemblance between our expressions for D_{KT} in Eq. (39) and the model suggested in Ref. [13], where the non-perturbative five-quark state was studied. Similarly to our expressions for D_{KT}, the quark distributions in Ref. [13] involve both a Gaussian (in the form of R_0 which is excluded by Eq. (42)) and, in addition, propagators $\sim (k_\perp^2/\beta - m^2)^{-1}$ of the five quarks, which looks similar to our factor Z in Eq. (29) and is absent in the models of Refs. [10–12]. The quarks in Ref. [13] are assumed to be free and the gluon content is dropped. The principal difference between our approach and the one of Ref. [13] is that we do not specify the content of the colored ensemble of the partons remaining after emission of the active gluon off the hadron, while in Ref. [13] it consists of free and stable quarks.

V. NON-PERTURBATIVE GLUON INPUTS IN COLLINEAR FACTORIZATION

Transition from the input $\Phi(k_\perp^2)$ in K_T-Factorization to the input φ in Collinear Factorization can be done with integration of Φ over $k_\perp$. That transition is again an approximation and leads to the following expression:

$$\varphi({\mu'}_1^2, {\mu'}_2^2) \approx \left[R'\left({\mu'}_1^2\right) + R'\left({\mu'}_2^2\right)\right] + \int_0^w dk_\perp^2 \, \Phi_B\left(k_\perp^2\right), \tag{45}$$

where the expression in the squared brackets corresponds to integration of Φ_R. In contrast, a general structure of the DGLAP fits for Collinear Factorization is (see e.g. Ref. [2]):

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(\beta, \mu_{col}^2) = N C_1(\beta) C_2(\beta) C_3(\beta), \tag{46}$$

where N is a normalization and the β-dependent factors[2] are:

$$C_1 = \beta^{-a}, \; C_2 = (1-\beta)^b, \; C_3 = (1 + c\beta^d), \tag{47}$$

with phenomenological parameters $N, a, b, c, d > 0$ defined from analysis of experimental data. All these parameters implicitly depend on the factorization scale μ_{col}. The expressions in Eqs. (45) and (46) look contradicting each other. Below we discuss the difference between them in detail. In what follows we will address the integrated parton density $\widetilde{\varphi}$ as the conventional input.

[2] We keep the notation β in Eqs. (46, 47) instead of the commonly used notation x in order to follow our previous notations.

A. Discussion of the difference between φ and $\widetilde{\varphi}$

The main points of disagreement between $\varphi(\mu'^2_1, \mu'^2_2)$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}(\beta, \mu^2_{col})$ are:
(a) $\varphi(\mu'^2_1, \mu'^2_2)$ is non-perturbative because it is obtained from the non-perturbative input Φ_{KT} while the conventional input $\widetilde{\varphi}(\beta, \mu^2_{col})$, with μ^2_{col} being arbitrary, includes both perturbative and non-perturbative contributions.
(b) The factorization scale μ_{col} is arbitrary while the non-perturbative scales $\mu'^2_{1,2}$ are fixed because correspond to the maximums of $\Phi(k^2_\perp)$.
(c) The non-perturbative input $\varphi(\mu'^2_1, \mu'^2_2)$ does not depend on β while the conventional input $\widetilde{\varphi}(\beta, \mu^2_{col})$ explicitly depends on this variable.

Now we explain how to reconcile the disagreement between Eqs. (45) and (46):
It is easy to evolve ϕ from the scales $\mu'^2_{1,2}$ to a greater scale μ^2_{col} ($\mu_{col} > \mu'_{1,2}$) by perturbative means (e.g. with DGLAP). Technically speaking, his operation moves a part of perturbative contributions from the perturbative blobs down to the non-perturbative inputs. As a result, the evolved inputs depend on the scale μ^2_{col} and include both perturbative and non-perturbative contributions and the perturbative contributions bring an explicit dependence of the inputs on β.

Let us discuss in more detail the role of each of the factors $C_{1,2,3}$ in the factorization convolutions. The singular factor $C_1(\beta)$ in Eq. (47) provides the fast growth of the parton distributions at small x. Furthermore, it leads to the Regge asymptotics x^{-a} at $x \to 0$. It is proved in Ref. [4] that the factor C_1 mimics accounting for the total resummation of $\ln^n(1/x)$. When such resummation is taken into account, inclusion of $C_1(\beta)$ into non-perturbative inputs becomes irrelevant and this factor should be dropped to avoid a double counting. Similarly, the term $C_2(\beta)$ of Eq. (47) is very much alike to the large-x asymptotics at $x \to 1$. It drives us to suggest that the origin of C_2 is perturbative; this factor mimics total resummation of $\ln^n(1-x)$ and therefore this factor can be excluded from the fits when the resummation is taken into account. Now we give our interpretation to the factor C_3. The asymptotic expressions C_1, C_2 cannot reliably represent the parton distributions at non-asymptotic values of x (concerning reliability of the Regge asymptotics see Ref. [4] and references therein). So, the factor C_3 is required when the asymptotic factors C_1 and C_2 are used outside the asymptotic regions. We call C_3 the interpolation factor. When the total resummation of logarithms of small and large x is taken into account, the interpolation factor C_3 becomes unnecessary and can be dropped together with factors C_1 and C_2, which means merging the inputs $\widetilde{\varphi}$ and φ. Therefore, we have demonstrated that the difference between $\widetilde{\varphi}$ and φ is caused by inclusion of perturbative contributions in $\widetilde{\varphi}$.

VI. SUMMARY

In the present paper we have constructed the non-perturbative inputs for the elastic gluon-hadron scattering amplitudes in the forward kinematics and considered the cases of polarized and non-polarized hadrons. The Optical theorem allowed us to proceed from the gluon-hadron scattering amplitudes to the gluon distributions in the hadrons. Before specifying our model, we derived general theoretical restrictions (16,18) on the non-perturbative inputs, which are obligatory for any model. These restrictions follow from the obvious argument that integration of the factorization convolutions must yield finite results. We used those conditions as criteria for modeling the inputs in Basic Factorization. Our model presumes that the gluon non-perturbative inputs in Basic Factorization consist of the polarization structures and invariant amplitudes $M_{U,S}$. Those amplitudes were represented in Eq. (23) as the products of the factors $R(k^2)$ and $Z(s_1)$. We used the results of Refs. [10–13] to choose the exponential (Gaussian) form for R and proposed the Resonance Model to specify the factors $Z(s_1)$, representing them in Eqs. (30,31) through superpositions of the resonances. We were guided here by the simple observation that after emitting an active parton off the hadron, the ensemble of spectators becomes unstable and therefore it can be described in terms of resonances.

Transition from Basic Factorization to K_T- Factorization causes reducing the inputs of Eqs. (30,31) down to the expressions in Eqs. (36,39). Eqs. (36,39) demonstrate that the inputs in K_T-Factorization are again given by the terms of the resonance type. However, a part of such terms is outside their resonance regions, so they can be regarded as a background. We proved that the simple Gaussian form (43) of the factor R contradicts the requirement (42) of IR stability of the factorization convolutions while the modified Gaussian (44) satisfies the requirement.

Moving from K_T- Factorization to Collinear Factorization, we reduced the expression for the gluon distribution in Eqs. (39), arriving at the expression of Eq. (45) for the input φ in Collinear Factorization and compared it with the conventional expressions for integrated parton distributions.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to A.V. Efremov, A. van Hameren, G.I. Lykasov, W. Schafer and O.V. Teryaev for useful discussions.

[1] G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys.B126 (1977) 297; V.N. Gribov and L.N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 15 (1972) 438; L.N.Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 20 (1972) 95; Yu.L. Dokshitzer, Sov. Phys. JETP 46 (1977) 641.
[2] G. Altarelli, R.D. Ball, S. Forte and G. Ridolfi, Nucl. Phys. B496 (1997) 337; Acta Phys. Polon. B29(1998)1145. E. Leader, A.V. Sidorov and D.B. Stamenov. Phys. Rev. D73 (2006) 034023; J. Blumlein, H. Botcher. Nucl. Phys. B636 (2002) 225; M. Hirai at al. Phys. Rev. D69 (2004) 054021.
[3] D. Amati, R. Petronzio, G. Veneziano. Nucl. Phys. B 140 (1978) 54; A.V. Efremov, A.V. Radyushkin. Teor.Mat.Fiz. 42 (1980) 147; Theor.Math.Phys.44 (1980)573; Teor.Mat.Fiz.44 (1980)17; Phys.Lett.B63 (1976) 449; Lett.Nuovo Cim.19 (1977)83; S. Libby, G. Sterman. Phys. Rev. D18 (1978) 3252. S.J. Brodsky and G.P. Lepage. Phys. Lett. B 87 (1979) 359; Phys. Rev. D 22 (1980) 2157; J.C. Collins and D.E. Soper. Nucl. Phys.B 193 (1981) 381; J.C. Collins and D.E. Soper. Nucl. Phys.B 194 (1982) 445; J.C. Collins, D.E. Soper and G. Sterman. Nucl. Phys.B 250 (1985) 199. A.V. Efremov and A.V. Radyushkin. Report JINR E2-80-521; Mod.Phys.Lett. A24 (2009) 2803.
[4] B.I. Ermolaev, M. Greco, S.I. Troyan. Riv.Nuovo Cim. 33 (2010) 57; B.I. Ermolaev, M. Greco, S.I. Troyan. Acta Phys.Polon. B38 (2007) 2243-2260.
[5] L.N. Lipatov. Phys.Lett. B116 (1982) 411-413; R. Kirschner, L.N. Lipatov. Sov.Phys.JETP 56 (1982) 266-273/
[6] E.A. Kuraev, L.N. Lipatov and V.S. Fadin, Sov. Phys. JETP 44, 443 (1976); E.A. Kuraev, L.N. Lipatov and V.S. Fadin, Sov. Phys. JETP 45, 199 (1977); I.I. Balitsky and L.N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. 28, 822 (1978).
[7] S. Catani, M. Ciafaloni, F. Hautmann. Phys. Lett. B 242 (1990) 97; Nucl.Phys.B366 (1991) 135.
[8] J.C. Collins, R.K. Ellis. Nucl.Phys. B360 (1991) 3.
[9] Dmitri Diakonov, V. Petrov, P. Pobylitsa, Maxim V. Polyakov. Nucl.Phys. B480 (1996) 341; H. Avakian, A.V. Efremov, P. Schweitzer, F. Yuan. Phys.Rev. D81 (2010) 074035; Ivan Vitev, Leonard Gamberg, Zhongbo Kang, Hongxi Xing. PoS QCDEV2015 (2015) 045; Asmita Mukherjee, Sreeraj Nair, Vikash Kumar Ojha. Phys.Rev. D91 (2015), 054018.
[10] K. Golec-Biernat, M. Wusthoff, Phys. Rev. D60 (1999) 114023.
[11] H. Jung hep-ph/0411287.
[12] A.V. Lipatov, G.I. Lykasov, N.P, Zotov. Phys. Rev. D59. (2014) 014001; A. A. Grinyuk, A. V. Lipatov, G. I. Lykasov and N. P. Zotov. Phys. Rev. D 93 (2016) 014035.
[13] Jon Pumplin PRD 73 (2006) 114015.
[14] C. Lorce, B. Pasquini, P. Schweitzer. JHEP 1501 (2015) 10.
[15] Yan-Qing Ma, Jian-Wei Qiu. Int.J.Mod.Phys.Conf.Ser. 37 (2015) 1560041; Yan-Qing Ma, Jian-Wei Qiu. arXiv:1404.6860; Martha Constantinou. PoS CD15 (2015) 009.
[16] V.V. Sudakov. Sov. Phys. JETP 3(1956)65.
[17] B.I. Ermolaev, M. Greco, S.I. Troyan. Eur.Phys.J. C71 (2011) 1750; B.I. Ermolaev, M. Greco, S.I. Troyan. Eur.Phys.J. C72 (2012) 1953.
[18] B.I. Ermolaev, M. Greco, S.I. Troyan. Eur.Phys.J. C75 (2015)7, 306.
[19] B.I. Ermolaev, M. Greco, F. Olness, S.I. Troyan. Phys.Rev. D72 (2005) 054001.